REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed on June 4, 2004 (Paper No. 8). Claims 1 and 31 are directly amended and claims 59-62 are newly added. Claims 1-62 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and present claims are respectfully requested. Applicants should not be presumed to agree with any statements made by the Examiner regarding the rejections made in the Office Action unless otherwise specifically indicated by the Applicants.

I. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-7, 17-21, 25, 29-31, 34-37, 42, 47-51, 55, 57, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,184,877 to *Dodson, et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

A. Claims 1 and 31

> 1. A programmable television services client device for enabling a user to search for television program information, said client device comprising:
>
> **memory of said client device for storing data that includes interactive program guide (IPG) database;**
>
> display configuration information contained in said memory that includes a guide arrangement, wherein said guide arrangement is configured in a search format for displaying at least one prompt for user input designating at least one television program search parameter; and
>
> a processor configured to **search in said IPG database of said memory based on said at least one television program search parameter** and cause a search result related to said television program search parameter to be displayed on a viewing device, wherein said processor is responsive to user input.
>
> (Emphasis Added)

31. A method for implementing a programmable television services client device to enable a user to search for television program information, said method for implementing a programmable television services client device comprising the steps of:

implementing display configuration information in a memory of said client device that includes a guide arrangement and interactive program guide (IPG) database, wherein said guide arrangement is configured in a search format for displaying at least one prompt for user input designating at least one television program search parameter;

searching in said IPG database of said memory based on said at least one television program search parameter; and

causing a search result related to said television program search parameter to be displayed on a viewing device, wherein said processor is responsive to user input.

(Emphasis Added)

Applicants respectfully submit that *Dodson* fails to disclose or teach at least the feature of searching in an interactive program guide (IPG) database of a memory of a client device based on at least one television program search parameter, as recited in claims 1 and 31.

As an initial matter, *Dodson* discloses as follows:

The present invention relates to a system and method for accessing television program information, particularly context sensitive information, some of which may be found through the Internet.

A method and system according to the present invention is presented for interactively accessing program information on a television, the method comprising receiving a search request; generating at least one automatic search term regarding a program for television; and ***searching the Internet for requested information***.

(Emphasis Added)

Further, *Dodson* apparently discloses accessing automatic search terms in various ways in a memory of a *Dodson* set-top box (column 3, lines 7-28), but nowhere does *Dodson* disclose searching the memory of the client device using a television program search parameter.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Dodson* does not disclose searching in an interactive program guide (IPG) database of a memory of a client device based on at least one television program search parameter as recited in claims 1 and 31. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the *Dodson* reference and so *Dodson* does not anticipate claims 1 and 31. Accordingly, for at least this reason, among others, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 31 be allowed and the rejection be withdrawn.

Because independent claims 1 and 31 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 4-7, 17-21, 25, 29-30, 34-37, 42, 47-51, 55, 57, and 58 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 4-7, 17-21, 25, 29-30, 34-37, 42, 47-51, 55, 57, and 58 contain all features and elements of their respective independent based claim. *See, e.g., In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to dependent claims 4-7, 17-21, 25, 29-30, 34-37, 42, 47-51, 55, 57, and 58 should be withdrawn for at least this reason, among others.

II. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 8-16, 22-24, 26-28, 32, 33, 38-46, 52-54 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Dodson* as applied to claims 1, 17, 25, 31, 51, and 55 and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,849 to *Boyer, et al.*

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the prior art reference must suggest all steps/elements/features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Because independent claims 1 and 31 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2, 3, 8-16, 22-24, 26-28, 32, 33, 38-46, 52-54 and 56 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2, 3, 8-16, 22-24, 26-28, 32, 33, 38-46, 52-54 and 56 contain all features and elements of their respective independent based claims. *In re Fine*, supra. Accordingly, the rejection to dependent claims 2, 3, 8-16, 22-24, 26-28, 32, 33, 38-46, 52-54 and 56 should be withdrawn for at least this reason, among others.

III. New Claims 59-62

Because independent claims 1 and 31 are allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 59-62 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 59-62 contain all features and elements of their respective independent based claim. *In re Fine, supra.*

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully maintain that the currently pending claims 1-62 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions that would place the subject patent application in better condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.

Jeffrey R Kuester, Reg. No. 34,367
Attorney for Applicant

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Atlanta, GA 30339
Ph: (770) 933 - 9500
Fax: (770) 951 - 0933